

Date: Sat, 29 Oct 94 04:30:24 PDT
From: Ham-Digital Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-digital@ucsd.edu>
Errors-To: Ham-Digital-Errors@UCSD.Edu
Reply-To: Ham-Digital@UCSD.Edu
Precedence: List
Subject: Ham-Digital Digest V94 #358
To: Ham-Digital

Ham-Digital Digest Sat, 29 Oct 94 Volume 94 : Issue 358

Today's Topics:

 FTP source for 'RLI ver 18.x?
 Multi mode VHF/UHF recommendation?
 NoCal 00 goes after Packet BULLETins (3 msgs)
 OZ1AT SSTV system...a
 using passwords over packet
 X1JR2 Patch Problems

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Digital@UCSD.Edu>
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Digital-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Digital Digest are available
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-digital".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: Fri, 28 Oct 94 05:47:22 GMT
From: jangus@skyld.grendel.com (Jeffrey D. Angus)
Subject: FTP source for 'RLI ver 18.x?

In article <1994Oct27.085702.1@skyler.mavd.honeywell.com>
estey@skyler.mavd.honeywell.com writes:

>
> Does anyone know if there is a FTP site ... and the address ... that has
> the latest W0RLI software (ver. 18.x I think).

oak.oakland.edu

--
"1935 will go down in history. For the first time, a civilized nation has
full gun registration. Our streets will be safer, our police more efficient,

and the world will follow our lead into the future." - Adolf Hitler

Amateur: WA6FWI@WA6FWI.#SOCA.CA.USA.NOAM Internet: jangus@skyld.grendel.com
US Mail: PO Box 4425 Carson, CA 90749 Phone: 1 (310) 324-6080

Date: 28 Oct 94 18:43:19 GMT
From: rush@sparkyfs.erg.sri.com (David Rush)
Subject: Multi mode VHF/UHF recommendation?

Bob:

I can't speak for the other rigs, but I've been happy with my Yahoo FT-736R. It of course does FM, SSB, and CW on 2m and 70cm, with options to add up to any two of: 6m, 1.25m (220MHz), 23cm (1.2GHz).

I have added a 6m module to mine.

I've used it for 2m and 70cm 1200/2400 bps packet, too.

The rigs ability to separately tune, then lock together two bands makes it great for satellite. It even works with inverting transverters (one band tunes down, the other tunes up). Add a 70cm 100W amp and a couple of antennas on an az/el mount, and you've got a great satellite setup.

It's also handy that it has it's own built-in power supply, but you can run it off 12VDC, too.

Only complaints about it: 1) you can't see both xmit and recv freqs at the same time, and 2) the meter and freq display aren't very bright, although works well enough under most conditions (I expect it's hard if not impossible to read in bright sunlight).

Oh yeah, and it was a pain to modify for MARS, and could only open up the 2m (140-149.995 now).

David

David Rush Internet: rush@erg.sri.com
SRI International AmPRNet: david@n0oxh.ampr.org
Leavenworth, Kansas AX25Net: n0oxh@w0xk.#nwmo.mo.usa.na
(sister city to Wagga Wagga, Australia) Phone: 913 682 9101 Fax: 913 682 9119

Date: Fri, 28 Oct 1994 07:53:37 GMT
From: ke4dpx@gregl.slip.iglou.com (Greg Law)

Subject: NoCal 00 goes after Packet BULLETins

In article <1994Oct24.205835.11821@news.csuohio.edu> sww@csuohio.edu (Steve Wolf) writes:

>The point is being missed. Are packet bulletins addressed to either
>"all" or a like form of "all" (MUSIC, SEWING, CRAFTS, NAFTA, etc.)
>indeed informational bulletins?

>Is there a difference between:

- >1. My tuning in a W1AW transmission and listening to an ARRL bulletin.
- >2. My tuning in a packet BBS station and reading an ARRL bulletin.

>I submit that both forms of the bulletin are the same. I end up with
>identical information. In both cases, the bulletin is an
>"informational bulletin". In both cases, the transmission is
>one-way. There is not an exchange between two stations. The form
>that the data takes is irrelevant. The mode upon which the data is
>transferred is again irrelevant.

Playing Devil's advocate here, what's the difference between:

1. Getting on the repeater to announce I-65 is closed at the Brooks exit because of an accident.
2. Talking to "Joe" on the repeater and telling him I-65 is closed at the Brooks exit.

It can be argued that the first form is broadcasting and is therefore illegal per Part 97 of the FCC Rules and Regulations.

For what it's worth, I think most of the packet bulletins are within the rules and regulations. But there are a lot of messages that are questionable at best. Quite frankly, I think many people should use common sense before addressing a message (why send a message to 4SALE@ALLUS or 4SALE@WW when you know darn well it'll be sold before it makes it across the country, for example).

```
=====
73 de Greg  AMPRNet   - ke4dpx@ke4dpx.ampr.org [44.106.56.35]
              AX.25    - ke4dpx@wi9p.#ncky.ky.usa.noam
              Internet - greg1@iglou.com
=====
```

Date: Fri, 28 Oct 1994 07:33:06 GMT

From: ke4dpx@greg1.slip.iglou.com (Greg Law)
Subject: NoCal 00 goes after Packet BULLETins

In article <Cy3Buq.9s8@news.Hawaii.Edu> jeffrey@kahuna.tmc.edu (Jeffrey Herman) writes:

>I think it's always in the benefit of the ARS when a clarification
>of the rules are made in advance to violation notices being handed
>out. All it probably took was for a few to stretch what was considered
>appropriate use of packet for this clarification to be made.

Agreed, and I too appreciate the clarification of the rules prior to the issuance of NALs. I'm probably risking flamage, but many of the messages floating around packet BBSs don't have any relevance to amateur radio whatever and are sent as bulletins (aka broadcasting). What I view as a problem is the widespread abuse of the system. I see bulletins advertising amateur equipment for sale. This, in itself, is not a problem. Yet a large quantity of those messages are sent to ALLUS or, worse, WW. It's gotten so bad that I don't even bother to read the messages.

>On the back of our license it says, in part, 'Operation of the station
>shall be in accordance with Part 97 of the Commission's Rules.' Our
>signature on the front binds us to this statement.

Good words of wisdom, Jeff.

>If someone has a problem with this 00 and this clarification, I hear
>that packet might now be in use on the CB frequencies....

>>*** Yes, Fred, keep up the good work. I'm glad that you are doing all
>>*** that you can to make Amateur radio packet boring.
>>*** 73 George K7WWA @ K7WWA.#NOCAL.CA.USA.NOAM

>Boring maybe, but legal!

It's already boring. What little bandwidth we have on 1200 baud packet is wasted passing bulletins around the country that precious few actually read.

```
=====
73 de Greg  AMPRNet   - ke4dpx@ke4dpx.ampr.org [44.106.56.35]
              AX.25    - ke4dpx@wi9p.#ncky.ky.usa.noam
              Internet - greg1@iglou.com
=====
```

Date: Fri, 28 Oct 1994 13:57:38 GMT
From: Mitch@lexmark.com (Gary Mitchell)
Subject: NoCal 00 goes after Packet BULLetins

>>In article <389n39\$5at@ccnet.ccnet.com>, rwilkins@ccnet.com (Bob Wilkins n6fri)
says:

>>

>> [snip]

>>

>>3. The Information sent MUST BE RELATED TO, AND OF INTEREST TO
>>AMATEUR RADIO OPERATORS ONLY!

Lets say I have a friend who is a programmer (not a ham) and really interested
in the AX25 protocol (from a technical perspective). Wouldn't the above
statement rule out amateurs discussing it on the air. The word "ONLY" bugs me.

Thanks Gary, WB9TPG (Mitch@Lexmark.Com)

Date: Thu, 27 Oct 94 17:50:00 -0500
From: lars.rasmussen@woodybbs.com (Lars Rasmussen)
Subject: OZ1AT SSTV system...a

Hej Paulb@iconz.co.nz!

Mandag 24. Oktober 1994 skriver Paulb@iconz.co.nz til All:

P> Anybody got info about the OZ1AT SSTV / FAX software and hardware
P> / firmware interface ?

PC program, an a minor demodulator. No uP's in the demodulator. Have seen a
diagram once, but i can't remember what was put in the construction.

P> Wondering if OZ1AT (Anders) has an e-mail address ?

No.

His QTH is about 20 km's north of mine, but i seldom talk to him.
You can contact him via packet OZ1AT@OZ9BOX.

Greetings Lars !
OZ1HMN @OZ9BOX - Fido: 2:238/921.0 - HamNet: 12:210/105

--- GED 2.50.B0822+ / FE 1.41É+
* Origin: "(MO 22-09) DEL Binkley, SET MAIL=Portal, ED=GoldED (12:210/105)

Date: Thu, 27 Oct 94 17:47:00 -0500
From: bill.shymanski@mwcsinc.muug.mb.ca (BILL SHYMANSKI)
Subject: using passwords over packet

-> From: CASSIDY@saturn.rowan.edu (Kyle Cassidy)
-> Newsgroups: rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc
-> Subject: using passwords over packet
-> Message-ID: <38he1p\$iba@gboro.rowan.edu>
-> Date: 24 Oct 1994 22:55:53 GMT
->
-> i'm considering setting up a packet/internet gateway at my site, but
-> i'm concerned by the apparant lack of security. (i.e. if a user wants
-> to read his mail over the airwaves where anybody is listening, i
-> don't have a problem with that, but i don't want anybody who is
-> listening to then be able to log on as that user....) what i would
-> like to know is:
->
-> 1) is there a way to use non-echoed passwords over packet?
->

I've seen local FBB packet BBSes using a scheme whereby the BBS
gives you a list of 8 or so randomly chosen numbers from a list of
pairs of numbers; if you in turn supply the numbers that match these,
the BBS concludes that you are who your callsign says you are. Most
systems I've seen rely on the user's callsign.

-> and
->
-> 2) is it legal?

You'll have to ask a lawyer; in the US, there's a 5 foot shelf of
regulations for the Amateur Service. In Canada, yes, it would be legal
since our regulation only states "No amateur station shall use a secret
code." - authenticating a user ID isn't a code. Since the FCC has
discovered it can help reduce the budget problems by handing out massive
fines to amateurs without much hope of being effectively opposed, I can
see why you're concerned.

I'm beginning to think that only collecting QSL cards is legal on
amateur radio; as soon as you think of any application for ham radio,
someone will object its not legal.

73,
Bill
VE4STW@VE4KV.WPG.MB.CA (Packet radio address, not Internet.)

Date: Fri, 28 Oct 1994 11:59:17 GMT

From: jkbe@sdlena.ucsd.edu (John Bednar)
Subject: X1JR2 Patch Problems

Thanks for the timely responses. I patched the code last night and hope to change one site this weekend.

Thanks again Dave for all your dedication to this project.

John, WB3ESS

Date: Fri, 28 Oct 1994 13:38:26 GMT
From: gary@ke4zv.atl.ga.us (Gary Coffman)

References<CyCEKB.7Hq@wang.com> <38pcvri\$e3h@nntpd.lkg.dec.com>,
<CyD97q.2su@hamnet.wariat.org>
Reply-To: gary@ke4zv.atl.ga.us (Gary Coffman)
Subject: Re: NoCal 00 goes after Packet BULLetins

In article <CyD97q.2su@hamnet.wariat.org> no8m@hamnet.wariat.org (Steve Wolf N08M) writes:

>>|>Again, this discussion is not about speech content, but one-way
>>|>communications.

>>

>>Good, I'm glad you see our point then. The communication is two-way. I
>>send a packet to the PBBS and it sends me an acknowledgement. What is
>>one-way about that? The content may be construed as one-way, but the
>>communication is definitely two-way. That is unless you set up your
>>beacon text to be a 10 line cookie recipe. ;-)

>>

>

>The acks for ax.25 protocol are little more than the op at W1AW looking
>at the power meter and seeing that watts are going into the antenna. The
>acks mean that data is reaching the other BBS. We have no idea where the
>bits go from there. All we have in ax.25 is a remote wattmeter.

No, the acks say more than that. They are the packet equivalent of QSL. They acknowledge that a transmission has been received *correctly*. But BBS message passing consists of more than just AX25 acks. There is a rigid BBS protocol for forwarding *third party traffic* between these amateur stations. That has to be followed just as good traffic handling protocols have to be followed on a CW traffic net in order for the third party messages to be successfully handled. There are no one-way transmissions involved, nor is there any broadcasting, as defined in 97.3, involved.

The only thing that differentiates a cookie recipe from a Keplerian

element message or a "Best wishes from the World's Fair" message is the *content* of the third party message. On that topic, the FCC says only that the message content must not be commercial, and that it must not contain the "seven deadly words".

Gary

--

Gary Coffman KE4ZV		You make it,		gatech!wa4mei!ke4zv!gary
Destructive Testing Systems		we break it.		emory!kd4nc!ke4zv!gary
534 Shannon Way		Guaranteed!		gary@ke4zv.atl.ga.us
Lawrenceville, GA 30244				

Date: Fri, 28 Oct 1994 08:15:53 GMT
From: ke4dpx@gregl.slip.iglou.com (Greg Law)

References<FiHNuc4w165w@lmr.mv.com> <Cy6MMI.B56@wang.com>,
<wa2iseCy9pos.D5u@netcom.com>
Subject: Re: NoCal 00 , packet BBS that lists posts by "topic"?

In article <wa2iseCy9pos.D5u@netcom.com> wa2ise@netcom.com (Robert Casey) writes:

>Maybe, if someone writes new packet BBS software, they could establish
>"newsgroups". Like maybe: dx, mods, for_sale, wanted, help, recipes,
>images, IBMPC (small 7plus-ed programs, small meaning <20K max), Mac,
>debate (for those gun and such arguments), etc.

>I suppose someone could "simulate" the above now by grouping posts
>by the keyword in the to:<keyword>@<area>, like "images@www, forsale@usa,
>wanted@nocal, and such. You connect to this new packet BBS, it lists
>all the <keywords> in all the posts that have arrived since last time
>you logged in. Then you tell the BBS which <keyword> "group you
>want to list. Looks a little like a newsgroup.

>Anyone done this?

The KA9Q NOS variants already have this ability except that it truly does segregate messages into different folders. Private messages to me are put in my private mailbox while bulletins to FORSALE@anything are in the public FORSALE mailbox. It really is a better way to handle messages, especially since most people seem to want to view a small niche of messages. Hopefully MSYS and F6FBB will add such capabilities in the near future. Frankly, stuffing all messages in one pen is the pits.

=====
73 de Greg AMPRNet - ke4dpx@ke4dpx.ampr.org [44.106.56.35]

AX.25 - ke4dpx@wi9p.#ncky.ky.usa.noam
Internet - greg1@iglou.com

Date: Thu, 27 Oct 1994 17:43:22 GMT
From: dbushong@wang.com (Dave Bushong)

References<Cy7MvK.Gsx@utnetw.utoledo.edu> <Cy8J1v.3wA@wang.com>,
<1994Oct26.114636.5713@ke4zv.atl.ga.us>
Subject: Re: NoCal 00 goes after Packet BULLetins

gary@ke4zv.atl.ga.us (Gary Coffman) writes:

>I don't think it's illegal, certainly not under 97.113(b). There's
>no hint of material compensation involved. Nor do I think 97.113(c)
>applies since these messages are not broadcasts in the sense meant

My reference was to the updated rules that were published last year.
In these newer rules, compensation is dealt with in 97.113(a)(2).
Part (b) says this:

97.113 Prohibited transmissions.

(b) An amateur station shall not engage in any form of
broadcasting, nor may an amateur station transmit one-way
communications except as specifically provided in these rules; nor
shall an amateur station engage in any activity related to program
production or newsgathering for broadcasting purposes, except that
communications directly related to the immediate safety of human life
or the protection of property may be provided by amateur stations to
broadcasters for dissemination to the public where no other means of
communication is reasonably available before or at the time of the
event.

>As to wasting resources, 99% of what we do as amateurs could be
>considered wasting resources by that standard. We're certainly
>not going to be able to save up spectrum for later use, once the
>moment is gone, it's gone whether we send anything or not.

True, perhaps, but my time is limited, and if I can't log onto the
local BBS because cookie recipes are being uploaded/downloaded, then I
see it as a waste of resources. I do favor stressing the system, so
that heavy-traffic incidents such as disaster relief can be prepared
for. I'd probably prefer a 10-line cookie recipe over a 200 line
Kep listing, but Keps are of direct interest to the general amateur
community, and as such are not illegal under part 97.

>The subject
>of content of speech is an area where the government should
>tread very carefully, if at all.

Again, this discussion is not about speech content, but one-way communications.

73,
Dave

--
Dave Bushong
OPEN/image Recognition Products

Date: Fri, 28 Oct 1994 13:16:40 GMT
From: gary@ke4zv.atl.ga.us (Gary Coffman)

References<Cy3Buq.9s8@news.Hawaii.Edu> <38k0lg\$5jt@kelly.teleport.com>,
<19940ct26.133813.7352@galileo.cc.rochester.edu>
Reply-To: gary@ke4zv.atl.ga.us (Gary Coffman)
Subject: Re: NoCal 00 goes after Packet BULLetins

In article <19940ct26.133813.7352@galileo.cc.rochester.edu>
rdewan@uhura.cc.rochester.edu (Rajiv Dewan) writes:
>In article <38k0lg\$5jt@kelly.teleport.com> genew@teleport.com (Gene Wolford)
writes:
>>Oh, goody. We can all snooze away in compliance.
>>All bow to the mighty ARRL, (Anally Retentive Regulation Lovers).
>>Beware the dreaded "00"s, (Kilocycle Kops).
>>Heil!
>
>You have clearly missed the whole point of amateur radio in US being
>a self policing hobby. Would you like ham radio turn into the chaos
>of CB?

No one wants that, however you've misinterpreted what self policing means. It does not mean vigilantes or self-important kilocycle cops. It means that each amateur is supposed to police *himself*, IE voluntary compliance with good operating practices. Admiral Grace Hopper said it best when she said, "it's better to beg forgiveness than to ask permission" in reference to dealing with government bureaucracies. Even the ARRL itself has often maintained that amateurs should not ask the Commission for rulings. They almost always prefer to say no since it exposes them to the least risk. It's better to wait and let them tell you that something

you're doing doesn't suit them. They rarely do, and it gives us much more flexibility.

I'm not overly concerned about what an FCC staffer said about "bulletins" being one way transmissions. They obviously are not, and the FCC staffer likely isn't familiar with the corrupt terminology used by amateurs, so he didn't understand that the "bulletins" in question are actually third party traffic passed between amateur stations. This will eventually be straightened out when the right ear is reached. The FCC has already declared packet messaging systems to be handling *third party traffic*, so there can be no question that this traffic is broadcasting. What irritates me about this whole episode is that a Kilocycle Cop went to the FCC with his ill-conceived question and thus got an unfavorable ruling that will now have to be undone.

Gary

--

Gary Coffman KE4ZV		You make it,		gatech!wa4mei!ke4zv!gary
Destructive Testing Systems		we break it.		emory!kd4nc!ke4zv!gary
534 Shannon Way		Guaranteed!		gary@ke4zv.atl.ga.us
Lawrenceville, GA 30244				

Date: Fri, 28 Oct 1994 14:07:50 GMT
From: dbushong@wang.com (Dave Bushong)

References<1994Oct26.114636.5713@ke4zv.atl.ga.us> <CyCEKB.7Hq@wang.com>,
<1994Oct27.220625.12814@ve6mgs.ampr.org>
Subject: Re: NoCal 00 goes after Packet BULLETins

mark@ve6mgs.ampr.org (Mark G. Salyzyn) writes:

>dbushong@wang.com (Dave Bushong) writes:

>> (b) An amateur station shall not engage in any form of
>>broadcasting, nor may an amateur station transmit one-way
>>communications except as specifically provided in these rules;

>AX.25 is specifically allowed for in the rules ...

Where?

There is a mention of AX.25 in the section about station control (97.109(d)), talking about re-transmitting signals unattended above 50 MHz, but I didn't see anything about "one-way communications." Did I miss that?

73,
Dave

--

Dave Bushong
OPEN/image Recognition Products

Date: 28 Oct 1994 12:34:09 GMT
From: bill@triangle.cs.uofs.edu (Bill Gunshannon)

References<Cy8J1v.3wA@wang.com> <1994Oct26.114636.5713@ke4zv.atl.ga.us>,
<CyCEKB.7Hq@wang.com>
Subject: Re: NoCal 00 goes after Packet BULletins

In article <CyCEKB.7Hq@wang.com>, dbushong@wang.com (Dave Bushong) writes:
|>
|> >As to wasting resources, 99% of what we do as amateurs could be
|> >considered wasting resources by that standard. We're certainly
|> >not going to be able to save up spectrum for later use, once the
|> >moment is gone, it's gone whether we send anything or not.
|>
|> True, perhaps, but my time is limited, and if I can't log onto the
|> local BBS because cookie recipes are being uploaded/downloaded, then I
|> see it as a waste of resources.

Yes, and if I can't log onto the local BBS because ARRL Bulletins or DX BS
is being uploaded/downloaded, then I see it as a waste of time.

So what's your point??

bill KB3YV

--

Bill Gunshannon		de-moc-ra-cy (di mok' ra see) n. Three wolves
bill@cs.uofs.edu		and a sheep voting on what's for dinner.
University of Scranton		
Scranton, Pennsylvania		#include <std disclaimer.h>

End of Ham-Digital Digest V94 #358
